

The Report of the

MARION COUNTY



**ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

City of Indianapolis

Department of Metropolitan
Development

Division of Planning

SUMMARY

This document is a summary of the original 54-page report.

FEBRUARY 2000

INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY

Bart Peterson, Mayor

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL

John Bainbridge – *District #8*
Elwood Black – *District #6*
Philip Borst – *District #25*
Rozelle Boyd – *District #11*
James Bradford – *District #7*
Maggie Brents – *District #16*
Bob Cockrum – *District #19*
Lonnell Conley – *at large*
Curtis Coonrod – *District #5*
Beulah Coughenour – *District #24*
William Douglas – *District #10*
William Dowden – *District #4*
Ron Gibson – *at large*
Monroe Gray, Jr. – *District #9*
Phillip Hinkle – *District #18*
Karen Celestino Horseman – *at large*
Harvey Knox – *District #17*
Lance Langsford – *District #13*
Robert Massie – *District #20*
Mary Moriarty Adams – *District #15*
Jackie Nytes – *District #22*
Joanne Sanders – *at large*
Scott Schneider – *District #3*
Beurt SerVaas – *District #2*
Frank T. Short – *District #21*
David Smith – *District #23*
Bill Soards – *District #1*
Steve Talley – *District #14*
Jody Tilford – *District #12*

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Lance Bundles
Lillian Charleston
James Curtis, Sr.
Gene Hendricks
Lee Marble
Walter Niemczura
Steve Schaefer
Robert Smith
Randolph Snyder

DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Carolyn Coleman, Director

DIVISION OF PLANNING

Thomas Bartlett, Administrator
Alice Gatewood, Planner
Kevin Gross, Intern
Gina Bush Hayes, Planner
Keith Holdsworth, Principal Planner
Anne Leslie Kilponen, Senior Planner
Sheila McKinley, Senior Planner
Paula Schwabe, Senior Planner
J. Dennis Slaughter, Senior Planner

Introduction

The Marion County Growth Advisory Committee was formed in the fall of 1999 to explore and report to the Metropolitan Development Commission on ideas that will encourage better growth patterns and to identify tools to manage growth.

The group met four times in late 1999. Prior to each meeting the participants were sent reading materials for the purpose of stimulating thought and discussion. At the meetings, the committee heard speakers talk on topics germane to the issues of urban growth and held small group discussions. Notes were kept by Division of Planning staff.

The Growth Advisory Committee was composed of representatives of a varied and balanced group of organizations. (See list at the end of this report.)

The product of this effort is not a plan that recommends specific courses of action or maps out specific land uses for individual parcels of land. Instead this report looks at the current issues of urban growth and suggests which courses of action may be best suited to the Indianapolis area.

1 The Nationwide Issue of Rapid Urban Growth

Rapid urban growth, often called “sprawl”, has become a subject at the forefront of the national consciousness. The national press has been rife with articles and television news reports debating the various aspects of growth and sprawl.

In many locations around the country rapid growth has lead to the decline of older urban and suburban areas, loss of open space, and the loss of an area's traditional character. Typically physical and social infrastructure cannot keep up with increasing demands. Other typical results are increased dependence on the automobile for transportation, increased traffic congestion and concentration of the poor and minority population in the central city.

Causes of Sprawl

Decentralization is the dominant trend in U.S. metropolitan areas. In the 1980's and 90's, where central cities have dropped in population (e.g. Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago), their metropolitan areas have grown. Where central cities have grown moderately (New York City, Houston) or grown quickly (San Diego, Phoenix), their metropolitan areas have grown more quickly.

Decentralization requires land. In December 1999 the U.S. Department of Agriculture released its Natural Resource Inventory. The report revealed that development had doubled in the 1990's to more than three million acres per year. Nearly 16 million acres of open space were developed between 1992 and 1997. This was more land than in the entire decade from 1982 to 1992, which saw the conversion of about 13.9 million acres, or 1.4 million acres a year.

New housing starts in metropolitan areas are outstripping housing starts in the cities by roughly 6 to 1. Some of the urban growth is fueled by changing demographics. Nationally, the average household size has dropped from 3.33 persons per household in 1960 to 3.14 in 1970, 2.76 in 1980, 2.63 in 1990 and 2.62 in 1998. Frequently this means that the area of a metropolis is growing much faster than its population. Metropolitan Kansas City spread by 70% from 1990 to 1996 while its population increased by just 5%.

Growth in suburban industries and commercial areas has changed employment patterns. The outer suburbs are experiencing substantial job growth in comparison to the central cities. For example, for the years 1994 to 1997, the seven metropolitan areas in Ohio saw an aggregate gain of only 636 jobs in their central business districts, a gain of 18,874 jobs elsewhere in the cities and a gain of 186,410 jobs in their suburbs.

Consequences of Sprawl

The outcomes of these changes are evident throughout cities, suburbs and rural areas. Metropolitan areas are seeing poverty becoming more concentrated within the central cities. A 1997 study of all of the nation's metropolitan areas showed that between 1970 and 1990, the number of people living in high poverty neighborhoods nationwide nearly doubled from 4.1 million to 8 million people. The overall urban population in that time period grew by only 1.6%.

The established suburbs start finding they are suffering the same ills as their central city. Disinvestment and loss of the traditional character of the area are common problems.

The rapidly developing areas are also experiencing problems, such as traffic congestion, overcrowded schools and loss of open space. A typical example of the growth in traffic congestion is the Philadelphia region where population has increased by 3% while the number of vehicle miles traveled has increased 55%.

Typical suburban growth is automobile-oriented rather than pedestrian-oriented. Reasons for this range from exclusionary zoning ordinances, isolation of individual subdivisions from each other, to the loss of "mom and pop" stores. Increased auto-dependency works in a "chicken-or-the-egg" cycle of cause and effect with other suburban woes such as increased congestion, lack of mass transit, lack of sidewalks, and increasing distances from people's homes to employment, shopping, recreation, worship and health care. Scattered development and automobile dependence also have a detrimental effect on air quality. Vehicles account for nearly half of the ozone precursors emitted into the air of central Indiana.

Rapid urban growth puts a burden on local governments to provide and maintain infrastructure, to generate sufficient taxes, and to respond to emergencies (fire, ambulance, and police).

2 National Growth Trends Echoed by Indianapolis

There is evidence that sprawl is occurring in the Indianapolis Metropolitan Area as well. The following is a brief summary of information collected that points towards issues in growth for the Indianapolis Metropolitan Area, the probable causes of the situation, and the Growth Advisory Committee's comments about these issues as gathered from the meetings.

Indicators of Rapid Growth

Population Growth

Indianapolis' population has been increasing steadily since 1980 and is expected to continue along that path well into the 21st century. The Department of Metropolitan Development projects that the 2020 population of Indianapolis will increase over 7% from the 1990 population.

By the year 2020, the counties surrounding Indianapolis are expected to collectively have a larger population than Marion County for the first time. Since there is a significant amount of undeveloped land within Marion County, it is evident that a lot of development has "leapfrogged" this undeveloped land into the surrounding counties.

Land Use Conversion

Land use conversion has occurred rapidly in and around Marion County. In 1998 alone, DMD indicated that 8,540 acres were rezoned from agricultural land to another use. Much of this land was used for residential development.

Central Indiana had 12,969 building permits issued in 1998. Marion County comprised 35% of these building permits, but Hamilton County came in at a close second with 27%. Hamilton County was also listed as the fastest growing county in Indiana, followed closely by Hendricks County. To make room for this expansive growth, Hamilton County lost 13% of its farmland and Hendricks lost 11% between 1992 and 1997.

Transportation Indicators

Transportation is another indicator that Central Indiana has experienced high levels of growth. Commutes have become longer, both in distance and in time, and congestion has increased throughout Indianapolis as well as in the surrounding counties. Central Indiana leads the nation in increased traffic delays over a 15-year period (700% from 1982-1996). It is also estimated that the overall cost of travel will increase by approximately 31% by 2020 over 1996 figures.

Probable Causes

It is important to note that sprawl is the cumulative result of several different practices over a number of years. As a result, changing the direction of sprawl, or even slowing it down, will not be an easy or short-term task. The following table lists probable causes of sprawl in Indianapolis, not listed in any order of importance.

Cause	Description
Population Growth	Population estimates indicate a 7% growth rate in 2020 over 1990 figures for Indianapolis, which will naturally increase the amount of land needed.
Physical Geography	Indianapolis does not have any constraining natural features, which can facilitate sprawl.
Cost to Consumer of Facilities	Consumers are generally charged the same rate for facilities (electric, sewer, water) regardless of their location in the county. There is no incentive for people to live closer in or penalty for living in a more rural environment.
Planning/Development Practices	Large lot development has consumed a significant amount of land and strict separation of land uses has promoted the use of the automobile.
Transportation/Highways	Transportation has become so efficient and inexpensive that people have been able to easily move further out.
Housing Programs	FHA and VHA programs in the 1930's made it less expensive to build new homes than to buy existing homes.
Condition of Older Suburbs	The physical condition of and lack of amenities in older suburbs makes them a less desirable choice than a new home for a comparable price.

Committee Response

Following is a summary of the Growth Advisory Committee's comments on the current situation and its probable causes.

Rate and Quality of Growth

The general consensus of the Committee was that Indianapolis is neither growing too quickly nor too slowly. However, many participants cited concerns over the quality and diversity of the new developments occurring in certain areas. Most participants agreed that regional cooperation will be necessary to significantly affect the rate of growth, but they admit that will be difficult to achieve.

Housing Diversity

Overall, the participants indicated that a mix of housing is desirable for Marion County. They stated that housing diversity keeps the population stable and enables extended families to live nearby. Also noted was that Indianapolis is getting most of the new multi-family developments in Central Indiana due to strict zoning practices in many of the counties that border Indianapolis.

Open space

Some participants indicated that there is a sufficient amount of open space in the county, but that it is underused because it is not located where its users live. Also noted was that existing open spaces need to be used more efficiently and that some parks are plagued by perceptions of crime and low quality.

3 Forms of Land Use Management in Indianapolis

Among the current forms of land use management are the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinances, the placement of infrastructure, and the stabilization and redevelopment of the central city. These forms of land use control do not regulate the rate of growth, but they do impact the types, location, and form of growth.

Comprehensive Plan

A comprehensive plan is designed to serve as the long-range vision of a city by setting out the mission and goals that define the direction in which the city intends to move over a long period of time. Comprehensive plans usually include land use recommendations, as well as recommendations for environmentally sensitive areas, areas that are most in need of redevelopment, and undeveloped land, but they can also include more broad reaching goals as well.

Indianapolis' current Comprehensive Plan (adopted 1991 to 1993) is made up of four major parts:

1. An introductory document.
2. A series of maps depicting land use recommendations.
3. A narrative for each township.
4. The Thoroughfare Plan.

The introductory document lays out the planning process and provides an overview of the elements of the plan and development trends and policies.

The township plan maps are comprised of three key principles: intensity of use, land use categories, and indexing. Intensity of use refers to the level of activity that is associated with a specific land use. A higher level of activity corresponds with a higher intensity of use. Land use categories are recommended for every parcel in Marion County under the assumption that it will eventually be fully developed. The six main categories are residential, commercial, industrial, park, special use, and urban conservation. Indexing is a system of assigning secondary land use recommendations to specific parcels for those parcels that may involve some public expenditure or the fulfillment of some specific policy goal.

The township plan narratives discuss the specific issues and goals facing each particular township and designates critical areas. Each critical area has a unique quality or problem that needs special consideration and/or protection. Any rezoning, variance, or subdivision plat proposal that is considered in these areas should be closely scrutinized for differences from the plan recommendations.

The Thoroughfare Plan determines priority improvements for the roadways throughout Marion County and classifies existing roadways by their predominant function.

Zoning

Zoning is the most important implementation tool for the Comprehensive Plan. It covers every parcel in Marion County, and classifies them into one of four main zoning districts: residential, commercial, industrial and special uses. The individual ordinances that apply to each of these four districts regulate use of the land through limits on use and through development standards such as building height and lot area. Several secondary zoning districts address certain specific uses.

While zoning itself in Indianapolis does not directly affect the volume of growth¹, it can and does affect growth patterns. By offering some flexible options, the zoning ordinances help facilitate diverse developments within Indianapolis.

Rigid zoning laws are often blamed for promoting sprawl development. However, within Indianapolis's residential zoning ordinance, there are several options and regulations that provide for flexibility and creativity. These options include the Zero Lot Line Option, Cluster Subdivisions, and Planned Unit Developments.

Zero Lot Line Option

The Zero Lot Line Option allows for reducing the minimum side yard setback for one side of a lot to zero feet as long as certain regulations are in place. This allows for more compact development, which makes more efficient use of public infrastructure and places more people on a smaller amount of land, leaving more land for open space and other uses.

Cluster Subdivisions

Cluster Subdivisions provide for greater flexibility in the development and design of subdivisions, to allow for a more efficient use of the land, to protect topographical features, and to provide for common areas and open space. The Cluster Subdivision requires that:

- The overall maximum density must be equal to that of a regular development of the same zoning category
- The amount of open space must be greater than or equal to the total reduction of lot sizes, and must be preserved in its naturally occurring state for passive recreational use.

Planned Unit Development

Planned Unit Developments have been enabled for several different purposes. They are intended to:

- encourage more creativity in site planning and building
- encourage efficiency and aesthetics in the use of open space
- encourage variety in development patterns

¹ Zoning does require, however, sewer and water facilities for all residential developments besides those in Dwelling Agricultural Districts. This regulation is the most effective zoning tool that Indianapolis employs to prevent sprawl.

- facilitate flexibility and incentives for developers to create diverse developments
- encourage renewal of older areas
- allow for special consideration for property with special characteristics.

The major advantage in these types of developments is the flexibility of design and use. Special features can be protected through development that may not conform to the regulations required in regular developments. Uses can be varied and include residential and non-residential uses within the same development. This can create less traffic since the development could be more self-contained, and could be suitable for a wider range of residents.

Capital Improvement Plan (Placement of Infrastructure)

Indianapolis also affects the rate, placement and concentration of its growth through the placement of its infrastructure. This tool could potentially be the most effective growth management tool that Indianapolis currently has in place, because without sufficient infrastructure, development cannot take place without substantial investment from the developer.

Stabilization/Redevelopment of the Central City

Many cities and states have realized that they can slow the rate of far-flung, inefficient growth by making the central city more attractive to businesses and residents. A myriad of projects and programs exist that help to stabilize and redevelop central cities. In Indianapolis, three general focuses of these projects and programs are revitalization of the central business district, stabilization and redevelopment of central city neighborhoods and clean-up and redevelopment of brownfields.

Committee Response

The committee discussed some possible changes to the existing growth management tools, specifically to the comprehensive plan and to the zoning ordinances.

The committee discussed whether it is better to recommend specific land uses for each parcel or to recommend more generalized land uses that are guided by policy statements. Some committee members indicated that parcel based land use recommendations are often ineffectual because developers find it relatively easy to rezone to their desired use, and that it is very difficult to determine whether specific parcels are better suited for certain uses (i.e. single-family vs. multi-family). Instead they suggest a more policy-based Comprehensive Plan, or land use recommendations that represent broader areas instead of specific parcels (stressing flexibility to allow for more creative development).

Another idea was to institute performance zoning. Performance zoning ensures that development adheres to an acceptable level of performance or compatibility by establishing minimum criteria to be used when assessing whether a particular project is appropriate for a certain area. This type of zoning combines flexibility with the well-defined goals and rules found in conventional zoning.

4 Growth Management Tools in Other Cities and States

To judge from the popular press, growth management is a new concept, but of course it is not. Growth management tools have been developed and implemented in a number of communities across the country. Following are descriptions of some of the most notable forms of growth management.

Traditional Neighborhood Design

The term "traditional neighborhood design" is interchanged frequently with the terms "new urbanism" and "neo-traditional" design. These terms refer to a recent trend, primarily seen in new, upscale development, to design neighborhoods with features reminiscent of earlier eras. A primary goal of these communities is to be pedestrian and transit-friendly. Consequently, the architects and developers often design for traffic calming, mixed land uses, and higher densities at transit stops.

Cost of Community Services Study

A Cost of Community Services (COCS) study focuses on how various types of land uses affect local government taxation and spending. This type of study does not control growth rates directly, but does raise awareness of the issues involved.

A COCS study assesses whether the taxes generated from development exceed the costs of upgrading or expanding service. Local tax revenues increase as property values increase when farmland, open space and woodlands are developed. The costs associated with expanding public services to the new residents, however, may offset the additional tax revenues generated from development.

COCS studies have some limitations. Looking only at the fiscal impacts on local governments and school districts is too narrow in scope. New residents are beneficial to a community because they work, and spend much of their income locally, contributing to the economic base of the community. COCS studies also do not consider how growth increases the values of existing properties. As new taxes pay for better infrastructure such as schools and roads, property values (and thus the net worth of property owners) increase.

Impact Fees

Under an impact system, a local government will charge fees to recover the costs of providing public facilities (e.g. schools, parks, right-of-way, water, wastewater, natural resource and public safety) for each new development. Impact fees are one-time charges to new users of the government service. A local government will examine the proposed development, determine what facilities will be required to sustain the desired level of service, and charge the developer a portion of the cost to upgrade or construct the facilities. The fees are assessed when building permits or certificates of occupancy are issued. The cost of the fee is incorporated into the purchase price of the developed property.

The fees help ensure that new development does not strain public services and facilities. The beneficiaries of services pay specifically for the extension of local government facilities to them, rather than being subsidized by current users. The development community often opposes impact fees, preferring general property taxes, public bond issues, and traditional revenue sources. Impact fees are criticized for deterring development and increasing new housing costs, and resulting in inter-jurisdictional competition.

Mitigation Ordinance

The purpose of mitigation ordinances is to minimize the potential adverse impacts on facilities and natural conditions such as increased traffic, noise, or erosion, or degradation of wetlands, water quality, or air quality. If a proposed new development is likely to have a significant negative effect on an existing facility or natural feature, an applicant may be required to develop a mitigation plan as a condition of being granted a permit.

The two most common ways to mitigate an impact are by:

- restoring, creating, or enhancing an equivalent area or greater area than those altered as a result of the development; or,
- making payments, in advance, to mitigation banks which provide funding for a large mitigation site(s) that collectively compensates for many, usually unrelated, development projects.

Land Banking

Land banking is a term for the public purchase and set aside of land for future development. Airport authorities, school districts and other public agencies have historically engaged in land banking to purchase land in advance of immediate need to ensure a reasonable price. The price of undeveloped property, not yet facing development pressures, will probably reflect existing rather than speculative land uses. Consequently, public agencies may use land banking as a way to reduce the costs associated with the preservation of open space, creation of greenbelts, or preservation of agricultural tracts.

Urban Growth Boundaries/Urban Services Areas

Urban Growth Boundaries are used to define areas in which a community intends to grow over 20 years or more. The boundaries are located beyond current urbanized areas.

Within these boundaries local land use policies and infrastructure planning encourage new development of an urban density and character. Outside the urban growth boundary, land use policies and infrastructure planning discourage urban densities and land uses. For example, centralized sewer and water services would be planned within the urban growth boundaries. Outside the boundaries only land uses or densities that can function without central water and sewer would be allowed. Similarly land uses that require a higher level of public safety services would be discouraged in rural settings.

Urban growth boundaries and urban service areas are effective only if all governments within the future growth areas are committed to the objectives of the plan. Inter-local

agreements are necessary between affected jurisdictions to coordinate the incremental approvals of individual development projects. While urban growth boundaries must be definite to be effective, they also must be adjusted occasionally.

Purchase of Development Rights

Another approach to growth management involves actions to preserve open space or agricultural lands outside the urban growth area. Purchase of Development Rights allows property owners to sell or donate their rights to develop their land for non-rural land uses. The purchasers can be public agencies, individuals or land conservation organizations. The landowners are compensated for giving up the right to develop their land for specified urban land uses while they retain ownership and use of the land for continued agricultural or other specified uses. Development rights for specified urban uses are extinguished in this type of transaction. An Agricultural Conservation Easement (or open space easement) is recorded on the property following the sale of development rights.

Transfer of Development Rights

A technique related to the Purchase of Development Rights is the Transfer of Development Rights. Transfer of Development Rights does not control the rate of growth as much as it controls where growth might occur. Transfer of development rights requires a governmental mechanism to allow development rights to move from one site to another. Property owners may transfer their rights from a "sending area" to a "receiving area".

The local government determines the rights that can be transferred. The local government must also provide the mechanism for approval and recording of the transfer. This results in a reduction of development potential in the sending area and more intensive development in the receiving area.

Property Tax Reductions

By reducing taxes on agricultural properties and properties with natural qualities, a landowner may find retaining the current use of the land more economically viable. This would reduce the financial incentive to sell the property to a developer.

Unlike a conservation easement, the property tax reduction programs typically are not a permanent removal of development rights. Property may be removed from these programs if owners want to develop the land or if the property is no longer maintained within program guidelines. When withdrawing the land from the classification, the owner usually becomes liable for the taxes that would have been paid if the land had been assessed at its non-classified rate.

5 Growth Management Options for Indianapolis

Three factors tied up within the issue of urban growth are rate, distribution and quality. Rate refers to how fast development is occurring. Distribution refers to how land uses are mixed or separated within general areas of new development. Quality refers to how well the new development will hold up over time.

Committee members were asked the question “Is metropolitan Indianapolis growing too quickly, too slowly, or somewhere in between?” Although there was not complete consensus on the answer to this question, the general response of the committee is that Indianapolis is not growing too quickly. The committee was more concerned about distribution of growth and quality of development. These concerns led to the formation of two objectives.

1. We should strive to achieve a balance of land uses throughout the various parts of the county and the region. Balanced land use is important not only for tax base equity, but also for livable communities where people can live, shop, recreate and earn a living throughout the different phases of their lives.
2. New developments should be such that they retain their value over the long haul. Well-planned, well-built and well-maintained communities should retain their value and should not be a drain on society and government resources.

The Growth Advisory Committee discussed growth management options available for Indianapolis and provided some feedback on what they felt would be feasible.

Growth Management Tools

Infrastructure service area boundaries

An infrastructure provider indicated that a service area boundary would allow infrastructure to be developed more efficiently, and that it is less expensive to put sufficient infrastructure in before development occurs than to retrofit existing development. Participants said that service area boundaries that constrain sprawl are appropriate on a regional level, but not within Marion County by itself. Participants felt that Marion County should be developed at a higher density than the surrounding region to concentrate growth, reduce infrastructure costs, and contain sprawl. Varied rates could be used to encourage in-fill and reinvestment in older, served areas while discouraging growth in non-targeted areas.

The committee agreed that the provision of infrastructure in general should start with a coordinated vision for the region. They hoped that coordinated provision of infrastructure would help prevent “leapfrogging”, but cautioned that any policy statements or goals need to be enforced in the long run to make any significant change.

Impact fees

One participant noted that impact fees promote responsible development in that developments are created with the necessary infrastructure upfront. However it may be a better idea to charge the fees regionally rather than just in Marion County. If the rest of

the Indianapolis metropolitan region does not charge impact fees, the impact fees in the City of Indianapolis would increase the cost of development and would displace growth to the outlying areas.

A drawback to impact fees is that the costs are passed on from the developer to the consumer. The added cost to the homebuyer poses trade-offs. The homebuyer may forgo amenities or options in the new house that may later lower tax revenues or reduce the quality of the neighborhood.

Methods impacting distribution of land uses

Participants felt that a mix of land uses was important for livable communities and that a variety of housing types helps keep the population stable and enables extended families to live nearby. However, neighborhood groups often oppose a mixed uses. People tend to want to live next to other people like themselves. According to the participants, neighborhood groups are generally more concerned about the economic level of new residents than the type of housing proposed.

Traditional Neighborhood Design

Traditional neighborhood design is in its infancy in central Indiana. The Villages of West Clay, a traditional neighborhood design community, is now under construction north of Indianapolis in Hamilton County. The community is too new to assess its success, but its mere existence shows that at least some builders and lenders believe that the Indianapolis region is ready for this concept.

Certain principles of TND are also seen in Indianapolis' Home Ownership Zone (HOZ). The HOZ initiative is the Department of Housing and Urban Development's response to decaying urban areas across the nation. The HOZ will create a mix of new and renovated housing at both market and affordable rates available to people who want to live in a safe revitalized neighborhood in the central city.

Cost of Community Services Study

Although this tool does not directly control growth, it does provide information that can be used to make choices about the community. In many communities this type of study points out the benefit of having commercial and industrial uses within the area. These studies also tend to point out fiscal value of open space. However in these studies, starter homes often appear as financial drains to the community and thus may prejudice decision-makers against them.

Methods impacting quality of development

Communities that remain vibrant and healthy over time are usually those that were well-built in the beginning and have built and retained amenities over time. Among the many amenities that contribute to healthy communities are a healthy environment, pedestrian orientation, nearby convenience retailing, nearby quality schools, and parks and open space. Among the typical growth management tools, mitigation ordinances, land banking, and urban growth boundaries all have an effect on the quality of development.

Mitigation Ordinances

Mitigation ordinances enhance the quality of development by minimizing the effects of certain types of development. Some of the mitigation measures that have been used in Indianapolis to mitigate the effects of traffic generated by certain large developments and to mitigate the effects of development in wellfields.

Land Banking

Land banking can contribute to the quality of development by ensuring that land for public purposes will be available when it is needed. Land banking could conceivably also preserve land for large scale private uses that contribute to the public good.

Urban Growth Boundaries

Urban growth boundaries, by limiting the spread of a metropolis, makes central city and older suburban sites more attractive for rehabilitation and reuse and can help these sites retain or recapture a high quality of community life.

Urban growth boundaries have been seriously considered by at least two Indiana communities, one of which is in central Indiana. This suggests that at some point the Indianapolis region may be willing to consider such a step.

Methods impacting open space

Open space consists of parkland, agricultural areas, natural areas and any area that is essentially “unbuilt”. The Growth Advisory Committee focused most heavily on parkland, noting that open space in the form of parks and other recreational facilities is important to the quality of life in the area.

The committee noted was that concepts of green space and parkland have changed to include trails and greenways, which opens up the possibility for acquisition of land that had not previously been considered suitable for recreational use (i.e. floodways).

Purchase of Development Rights/Transfer of Development Rights

During 1999 the Agricultural Matters Committee of the Indiana General Assembly recommended a bill that would enable local plan commissions to purchase conservation easements to assure the availability of land for agricultural use. The proposed bill also provided that a zoning ordinance may permit the transfer of development rights between parcels of land. The same committee recommended another bill that would establish a Conservation Easement Account within the Indiana Heritage Trust Fund. The account would be used to purchase conservation easements. Both bills are expected for re-introduction in the 2000 legislative session. These bills represent recommendations stemming from the Indiana Farmland Preservation Task Force's Final Report.

Property Tax Reductions

Property tax reduction to protect farmland or lands with natural qualities is probably not feasible in Marion County. The growth management tool is typically not effective in areas of heavy development demand because the prices developers are willing to pay are greater than the property tax benefits.

List of Sources

Books:

Rural Environmental Planning for Sustainable Communities. Frederic O. Sargent, Paul Luck, Jose A. Rivera, and Maria Varela. 1991.
Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City. Paul A. Jargowsky. 1997.

Reports:

“Current Population Reports.” U.S. Bureau of the Census.
“1997 Census of Agriculture.” U.S. Department of Agriculture.
“Pathways to the Future.” Indianapolis Parks and Recreation. 1999.
“Marion County, Indiana 1995 to 2020 Population Projections.” Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development. 1995.
“Hoosier Farmland Protection Taskforce Recommendations Summary.” Hoosier Farmland Protection Taskforce. 1998.
“Staying Inside the Lines: Urban Growth Boundaries.” V. Gail Easley. American Planning Association. 1992.
“Vision Plan.” Central Indiana Regional Citizens League. 1999.

Magazine articles:

“Can We Grow Smarter?” Tim Horton.
“The Brawl over Sprawl.” Richard Lacayo.

Presentation:

“Sprawl-The Good, The Bad, The Ugly.” Speech by Bruce Katz of The Brookings Institution. November 9, 1999.

Websites:

Builders Association of Greater Indianapolis (www.bagi.com)
Central Indiana Land Trust. (www.cilti.org)
California Governor’s Office of Planning & Research. Putting Action into the Open Space Element: Land Banking. (www.cere.ca.gov/planning/open_space/banking.html)
Colorado Department of Local Affairs Division of Local Government. (www.dlg.oem2.state.co.us/fs/toolacqui.htm)
Congress for the New Urbanism (www.cnu.org)
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Urban Land Policies for the Uninitiated. (www.unexcap.org/huset/land_policies/index.htm)
Land Trust Alliance. (www.lta.org/index.html)
Local Government Commission. Center of Livable Communities. (www.lgc.org/clc)
The New Towns & Neighborhoods Center. (www.townbuild.com)
Ohio State University Extension. (www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~ohionline/cd-fact/1260.html)
Planners Web. Planning Commissioners Journal. Sprawl Resource Guide. (www.plannersweb.com)
Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance. (www.spokanecounty.org/lrp/11.20.050.htm)
The Trust for Public Land. (www.tpl.org)

Members of the Marion County Growth Advisory Committee

The organizations invited to be a part of the Marion County Growth Advisory Committee reflect a broad range of viewpoints on development issues. Some groups were represented by different persons over the course of the four meetings.

American Institute of Architects,
Indianapolis Chapter
Joe Zody
Apartment Association of Indiana
Lynn Moistner
Bank One
Andy Burroughs
Builders Association of Greater
Indianapolis
Roger Stephens
Jan Hope
Castleton East Civic Organization
Daniel Kloc
Central Indiana Regional Citizens League
John Hay, Jr.
Consulting Engineers of Indiana
Judith Congdon
Steve Fehribach
Stephanie Morse
Historic Urban Neighborhoods of
Indianapolis
Lynn Pannicke
Hoosier Environmental Council
Tim Maloney
Indiana Urban Schools Association
Douglas Williams
Bill Brown
Indianapolis Airport Authority
Mark Gelband
Indianapolis Bar Association, Land Use
Section
Joe Calderon
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce
Susan McCaffrey
Indianapolis Deptment of Capital Asset
Management
Dennis Neidigh
Indianapolis Housing Agency
Gene Jones
Margaret Barron

Indianapolis Public Schools
Dona Sapp
Indianapolis Water Company
Thomas Bruns
Lora McCormick
Chris Purcell
Indy Parks
Jim Parham
Donald Colvin
Tina Jones
IUPUI- School of Public & Environmental
Affairs
John Ottensmann
Lawrence Township Assessor
Paul Ricketts
Christie Ricketts
Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood
Associations
Marshall Lewis
George Haerle
Marion County Soil & Water
Conservation District
Marcia Matthieu
Metropolitan Development Commission
Gene Hendricks
Steve Schaefer
Metropolitan Indianapolis Board of
Realtors
Chris Pryor
Metropolitan Planning Organization
Michael Peoni
Sierra Club, Heartlands Group
Steve Wade
Phyllis Zimmerman
State Senate District 32
Pat Miller
Urban League of Indianapolis
Sam Jones
George Neal